

Remarks

The examiner's reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the further amendments above and comments which follows.

Regarding sections 1 through 4 of the office action and the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, the matters raised by the examiner have been addressed in the claim amendments above. As the examiner correctly indicates, the applicants understood the examiner's previous explanation as a suggestion of claim language, but since the examiner explains that is not the case, the claims have been appropriately amended. Clearly, now, the trays and plates are elements of the invention, and the other matters raised by the examiner have been appropriately addressed when amending. It is submitted that the claims clearly meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. Section 112 and are definite.

In numbered section 5 beginning on page 5 of the office action, the examiner has rejected independent claims 67, and dependant claims 64 and 65, under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 as being anticipated by Guy, U.S. Patent Number 5,217,572. In numbered section 4 beginning at the bottom of page 6 of the office action, the examiner rejects all of the claims under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being obvious over Hanaway, U.S. Patent Number 4,643,839. Reconsideration of the rejections is urged.

First, with respect to Guy, it is apparent that the rejection is based on the mistaken belief that claim 67 does not include the trays and plates. That has been rectified by the amendments above.

In addition, Guy clearly fails to disclose a frame and trays made of a thermally conductive material. Furthermore, any conductive heating, which could be only via the small quantity of air in Guy's enclosed vessel 8, could only have a minimal effect on the samples to be evaporated. That is clearly not the case in the present invention.

With regard to Hanaway, the examiner's rejection is not understood, and in relation to amended claim 67, is believed to be moot, in any regard. The examiner has explained in the office action that the tower assembly of Hanaway could include an aluminum frame and trays, but there is nothing in Hanaway or the prior art to suggest that such is true. The disclosure of Hanaway is not related to the field of art of the present application, and it cannot be seen how Hanaway could be adapted, without perfect hindsight based upon the present application, to

meet the claimed invention. That Hanaway is from a different art is clear from the fact that Hanaway has no reference to any chamber in which samples are to be mounted, let alone a chamber that is subjected to a vacuum and radiant heat.

Given the above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and the examiner's further and favorable reconsideration is urged. If the examiner disagrees for any reason, an interview is requested. Please contact the undersigned based upon the information below so that this case, which is an important application to the assignee, can move forward as expeditiously as possible.

September 30, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Shakula
Registration No. 40,808

Barnes & Thornburg LLP
PO Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 (fax)